

South Church Union Lectures.

---

LECTURES

ON

TRACTARIANISM,

DELIVERED IN THE TOWN HALL, BRIGHTON.

BY THE

REV. HENRY NEWLAND, M.A.,

RECTOR AND VICAR OF WESTBOURNE.

SEMPER EGO AUDITOR TANTUM, NUNQUAMNE REPONAM?

LONDON :

JOSEPH MASTERS, ALDERSGATE STREET,  
AND NEW BOND STREET.

MDCCCLII.

LIBRARY  
CLAREMONT SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY  
1325 N. COLLEGE AVE.  
CLAREMONT, CA 91711-3199

LONDON:  
PRINTED BY JOSEPH MASTERS AND CO.,  
ALDERSGATE STREET.

BX  
5109  
.N48  
1852

## TRACTARIANISM.

---

THE last time I lectured here, I quoted a favourite maxim among us Tractarians about "everything at its proper time, everything in its proper place, and everything to its proper use." It is astonishing how much difficulty people experience in putting this maxim into practice, even so far as to enable them to distinguish what subjects are proper for a lecture-room and what are not. The last time I addressed you I was obliged to begin my lecture with protesting against the irreverence of making the market-place a place of prayer. I now protest against that of making it a place for handling holy subjects.

Matters of Church-discipline we are ready enough to handle, questions concerning this we are ready enough to answer, we are ready enough to prove that we are faithful followers of the Church of England, that our practices and teaching are ruled by our Church, that we never wilfully depart, either from her laws, or our engagements. Much more than this we are able both to explain and to prove,—and not able only but willing and ready—but this is not the place for it. If you want farther explanation, read our books, consult us in private, write to us with proper authentication of your names, that we may be sure our correspondents are not Gawthornes; above all, follow us to our Churches, not for the purpose of finding out faults, but with the wish to ascertain the true nature of our teaching. We invite you—like our Master we speak openly to the people, in secret we do nothing. If you do this, you

will soon find out that the teaching of the Church is the teaching of the Bible. All that we can venture to do in such a place as this, is to show you that our teaching is the teaching of the Church.

Take these lectures for no more than for what they are intended. I do not attempt to explain the doctrines of the Church of England, that for the present I leave to other hands, that I would wish to see treated of in another and a holier place, and in another and a graver style. Do you suppose that I would mix up the deep and mysterious truths of our religion with jokes and stories for popular amusement? I have spoken of those truths at a proper time and place, when I was preparing my flock for confirmation, when I was in my pulpit or my own study,—these are the places for such subjects; as soon as I have finished these lectures to you, I shall get my Confirmation Lectures to my own flock ready for the press. You have seen how I speak to those who come to me for amusement, you may then if you please see how I speak to those who come for instruction and improvement of their means of grace. All I undertake to do now and here is to show that we are faithful to our own engagements, that we teach that which at our ordination we promised to teach, that we follow the practices we engaged to follow, and submit to the discipline to which we bound ourselves to submit.

As I came into the room last time, a paper was put into my hands about the Sacramental System of the English Church, and after the lecture, when we permitted questions to be asked, a string of interrogatories were put forward about the Real Presence. The Record, I understand, abuses me for my levity in treating of such matters. If I treated of them AT ALL, in such a place, the Record would be quite right, but I never did, I never would, and as for you, we cannot permit any one at our lectures to bring forward subjects that we

do not venture to touch upon ourselves: when and where have we ever entered into discussions on these high mysteries? What could any one have seen in us to warrant him in imagining for one moment that we, who are appointed by God as the stewards of these mysteries, should be so unfaithful to our trust, as to permit them to be exposed to the multitude and desecrated in the lecture-room? Such matters as these, be assured, we do not ourselves approach without deep and earnest prayer, we treat of them either in the quiet of our retirement or in the House of God, never in places of worldly resort; and we should consider ourselves unfaithful to our other office, that of Ambassadors of CHRIST, did we permit you to do so. Be it then understood, we are not concerned now to prove that the Church of England is a true branch of CHRIST'S Holy Catholic Church; we believe it, as we would believe a thing on which our salvation depends, but this is not the place to prove it. If there are any who wish to attack their own Church, if there are any who would cast her down from her high place among the Churches of God, and degrade her into an Establishment of the State or an Institution of Man, let them do it, they are welcome to try their best and do their worst. We on our parts are ready and willing,—ay, and by God's grace able too—to defend her. But not here.

About what concerns ourselves we may speak, and speak here, and therefore as far as these points go, I will take notice of the printed paper which I alluded to before.

Upon what ground of common honesty can our system be said to bring forward a book of minor importance, meaning the Prayer Book, in opposition to the Bible, when according to the teaching of that Prayer Book, we bind ourselves to read openly in the ears of the people the whole of the Old Testament once, and

the whole of the New Testament three times every year, besides drawing their attention more particularly, on each successive Sunday, to some remarkable series of passages conveying in its proper order some special doctrine appropriate to the season? Ay, and not only bind ourselves to do so, but we Tractarians act up to our engagements and do it.

I am not acquainted with the writer of that paper, I hope he is in the room now, that he may hear me ask him publicly whether, if he is a clergyman, he has done this himself, and whether, if he is a layman, he has attended to this himself during the last year. If he has not and I have, I ask him which of us two makes the Bible his Book, which of us two is faithful to his engagements and which is not?

I will tell you what was once said to me by a Roman Catholic Priest. "You clergy of the Establishment," so he had the impudence to call our Church, "are very excellent men, very learned men, very hard-working men, very pious men, it is a great pity you have three faults, for without these you would be perfect."

Come, thought I, pricking up my ears, this is a pretty fair admission from an enemy. "And what may these three faults be?"

"Why," said he, "they don't say their creeds, they don't read their Bible, and they don't say their prayers."

"Whew!" said I, "what can you possibly mean?"

"Why," said he, "is it not so? I have often heard the Athanasian Creed left out at all events; as for the Bible, you are told, no doubt, to read some of it every day, but that is not the question, the question is, do you read the Bible which is appointed for you to read? As for your prayers, you have a common prayer no doubt, which you are told to say morning and evening throughout the year. I do not deny that; what I say is, that you do not do it, and we do."



“But, my good sir,” said I, “you are wrong; I do.”

“You!” said he, “what, are you the type of all the Clergy of England? will you venture to say that there is one in a hundred of them that does these things?”

Now what could I say? Is there? Is my friend the writer of the paper one of them? I do not think he is.

Now see how much he knows about us. See what he says. “The Tractarians will tell you so to run that you may obtain the prize; but it must be in their way, Baptism the starting point, and receiving the Sacrament the obtaining the prize—Sacramental Salvation!!”

The Tractarians tell him this! Why there is not a child in a Tractarian National School who would not tell him that Baptism is the starting-point no doubt—he is right enough there—but that his inheritance in heaven is the prize, and that the Communion is the nourishment or food appointed to strengthen his soul for the race. Bless your teacher’s innocence, he does not know a great deal about Tractarianism, and that is the way with all these Evangelicals. They paint a Tractarian according to their own ideas of what a Tractarian is, and then they proceed to demolish him, which they do not find a difficult job at all. The only thing is that the original is not much like the painting.

Mr. Neale was explaining to you in his last lecture how they had contrived a bracketed Prayer Book, the bracketed passages to be left out by people of tender consciences. I have never seen the book; do any of you know whether there is a bracket over the ninth commandment? it would be an uncommonly useful one to some people.\*

By the way, while you are about it, what do you say to a bracketed Bible? there are some very awkward

\* Since this lecture was delivered, a friend of mine, happening to pass by the Roman Catholic Chapel at Bath while the priest was catechising the children, went in to see how such things were done in

texts in it, that pinch the conscience in a most uncomfortable way; if these ingenious Evangelicals would only take that in hand they would be conferring a public benefit. There was either a Bible or a Prayer Book, if I recollect right, with the word [not] bracketed out of the seventh commandment; a few such brackets would make the Bible quite another book, it would not hurt the tenderest of consciences, and it would do very well for our modern houses of parliament, for Jew, Turk, Infidel, and Heretic, might use it alike. Think of this, some of you Evangelicals; turn it over in your minds, your party may find it useful.

And now let me explain to you how it was that I became a Tractarian.

I must, however, here ask you to call to mind what I said in my first lecture, that I answer to this name, not because it is my name, but because you please to call me by it. Miss Edgeworth says, if I choose to call my hat a cadwallader, and explain to you that I do call it so, my hat, for all practical purposes, is a cadwallader. Whenever I use the word, after having explained it to you, you would know that I meant by it the thing that I put upon my head. I have a perfect right to call my hat or your hat a cadwallader, the only objection to my doing so is, that I should have to explain the word a good many times; in fact, pretty nearly as often as I used it. And that is the only objection to a great many words, all of which will suit me very well. Are you a Catholic? say you: yes, that I am; but I do not blurt this out in all societies, because it would give me continually

that Church. The priest was not very long before he found out the heretic, and framed his questions accordingly.

“How many Sacraments have we in the Holy Church?”

“Seven,” was the ready answer.

“And how many have they in the Church of England?”

“Two only.”

“O no, my boy,” said the priest, “they had two, but the Privy Council has cut out one of them. They have only one left now.”



the trouble of explaining that I have no connection with the people over the way. Am I a Protestant? Yes, O yes; I am not at all ashamed of calling myself a Protestant, only I do not want to have the trouble of telling people that I have no connection with that coat of many colours,—The Protestant Alliance. Thus also I certainly am an Evangelical; perhaps I have a greater title to call myself so than some folk who rejoice in that name, for I not only carry to my people the glad tidings of salvation, but I do not shun to declare to them the *whole* counsel of God; still there is a long explanation to be gone through, which makes it very inconvenient to call myself an Evangelical, and so I don't call myself one.\*

Thus also if you like to call me a Tractarian, I am a Tractarian and I answer to the name, but I do not like the name, nor call myself so, because it gives me the trouble of repeating so often that I do not feel myself

\* Some of the old inhabitants of Brighton may possibly recollect my old rector, Mr. Ferryman, whose family then lived here: no one who had ever seen his herculean frame, his firm determined countenance, that looked as if it had been cast in iron, with his long white hair flowing over his shoulders, could ever forget him. When I got my present appointment to Westbourne and left his curacy he was about ninety, and looked still as if he could and willingly would play Entellus to any one's Dares.

When I went to take leave of him he was in conversation with my intended successor, a smart well-dressed self-satisfied looking youth, with an immense display of white shirt and black whisker.

"It may not exactly please you," said the young fellow, with an affected mincing tone, "I do not think it will, but I think it right to tell you nevertheless, that I am an Evangelical preacher and that I expect to be allowed to preach full Evangelical doctrines."

"Sir," said the old man, in his deep firm tones, "What then am I? what doctrines do I preach? Have you the conceit and impertinence to imagine that you and your own sect are the only people who preach Evangelical doctrines? You have been badly taught, sir, and worse brought up. Your youth may be some excuse perhaps, for your ignorance and presumption now, but it will be no excuse five or six years hence. Go home, sir, and read your Bible and learn your own duty as a Christian before you presume to teach other people."

bound to believe or to defend all that is written in the Tracts for the Times.

I will show you the sort of inconvenience I mean ; some years ago, at one of the Bishop's public dinners, there was a pertinacious little gentleman, who fixed a piercing gaze full in my face from a pair of truculent looking spectacles, and kept pegging into me across the table with "what have you got to say about the doctrine of Reserve? How can you look us in the face after Tract No. 90?" till at last I lost all patience, and electrified them all by bursting out: "My good friend, my name is not *Newman* but *Newland*, I never wrote one word of all those tracts, and what is more I never read them. I have sins enough to answer for of my own, and I won't be made to answer for the sins of other people."

Now then call me Tractarian if you like, and I will be answerable for my own writings, but don't make me answerable for everything that everybody has written, whom you choose to call by the same name, for that I will not stand to.

Well, but if I think it a trouble to answer to the name of Catholic, and Protestant, and Evangelical, and Tractarian, what are you to call me, what name will I call myself?

Call me an English Churchman, that is what I am, and there can be no mistake about that; as for my being baptized and an Englishman, there is my baptismal register at S. James', Westminster, for any one who likes to pay a shilling to see it; and as for my being a Churchman, I hold by the Apostles' doctrine in my creed. I remain in the Apostles' fellowship under my Bishop. I abide by the breaking of the Bread. And I am perfectly satisfied with the prayers. That is the way the Bible defines a Churchman, and that definition will do for me.

I am an English Churchman.

Having laid down this as the title by which I designate myself, I have no objection to tell you how it was I came to be a Tractarian, not that I mean you to infer from this, that at any known time of my life, I began to embrace the doctrines held by the Tractarians; theirs are the doctrines of the English Church, and I cannot tell you when and how I learnt them. I always held them, they grew with me. I understood them better as I grew older and read more, no doubt; but there never was a time in my life when I had them not.

Some of you may recollect Matthews and his exquisite readings; at the end of one of them an enthusiastic admirer rushed up to him, "O, Mr. Matthews," said he, "I will give you a hundred pounds if you will tell me who taught you to read." "I won't take your hundred pounds," said Matthews, "but I will tell you for nothing if you like. *It was my mother.*" So say I. My Spiritual Mother is the Church of England, and I can no more tell you how I learnt her doctrines than I can tell you how I learnt to breathe.

But how to apply her discipline I did learn, and I will tell you where and when and how I learnt it; at least I will tell you how it was my thoughts were first turned that way, and how it was I came to see the short-comings of myself and my brethren in the ministry, and how I found that we did not act up to our own engagements, and that we had got into slack habits, and slovenly practices, and had never found it out, because we were all one as bad as the other: and thus too did I find out what was the moral effect of all this upon our people. I wanted no Tracts for the Times to tell me this, neither did I read them. I found it out for myself, and I will tell you how I did it.

It is now a good many years ago since I was visiting a friend, who lived about two miles from the town of Geneva: my friend's establishment was a pretty large one, and contained a good many servants, some of

whom were Romanist and some Protestant. As for being honest or dishonest, good or bad, I suppose they were all very like any other servants, but in one respect there was a very marked difference between the Romanists and the Protestants. Geneva as a Canton is Protestant of some sort no doubt; but though there is an octroi at the gates of the town about bread and meat, and cheese and butter, though they are terrible protectionists in provisions, there is quite free-trade in religion. The Canton is divided into communes, who meet every year, and vote what religion they will be of for the next twelve months, and though most of these communes do like to be Protestant of some sort, and that is a pretty wide term, taking in, like your Alliance, every thing from Calvin to Socinus inclusive; yet now and then it happens for all that, that the Pope gets the majority, upon which the minority are expected to conform—something in this way:—my friend was painting a boat; one day the painter was missing; “What became of you yesterday?” said my friend. “Pardonnez moi, monsieur, I was keeping the feast of Saint Somebody.” “Keeping the feast of Saint Somebody—why you are a Protestant.” “C’est vrai, monsieur, but my commune last Tuesday was a week voted the other way, so I am obliged to keep the feast; but as for the Saint,” shrugging his shoulders, “Bah!” This is a digression; it is merely to account for the servants being a mixed establishment, and for there being a Roman Catholic chapel in a Protestant Canton; in fact there was one about a mile from the house.

In all those places there is daily service at a very early hour, one and all the Romanist servants used to get up to attend this service and to say their prayers getting back to the house just as their Protestant brethren and sisters were coming down from their bedrooms. Here was something to think about; both Papists and Protestants were told to say their prayers

and to assemble themselves in God's house. Both trees were to be judged by their fruits, and here were the Papists doing it, and the Protestants neglecting it. There must be some reason for this. Again, on Sunday, where were the Romanists?—one and all gone to mass, which I need hardly tell you is the name they give to the Holy Communion. Where were the Protestants? They certainly went to church *sometimes*; but as for the Holy Communion, they never thought of such a thing. Now this was singular; both these people had been told that “except they ate the flesh of the Son of Man, and drank His Blood, they had no life in them,” and the Protestants had the additional advantage of being able to read it in their own Bibles. Why did the one act up to it, and the other not?

Now it is quite true that the Protestants of Geneva are a very long way indeed from the Church of England, but I had had a little experience in parish matters too, and could not help recollecting, that the practice among the uneducated classes of my parishioners was very much more like that of the Protestants of Geneva, than it was like that of the Roman Catholics; there was the very same difficulty in getting them to church, and the very same difficulty in getting them to act as if they believed the Holy Communion to be a means of grace.

Another Sunday came, and as we went to church, the whole road to Geneva was blocked up by men, women, and children, and horses, and carriages. The whole town was turned out of doors, and every one was marching on foot or on horseback, to a place about four miles off, from which a continual peppering of musketry was heard all the day long, while a placard on the gates of the deserted city told me that the State, out of its fatherly considerateness for its children, and its unwillingness to interfere with their work, had selected that and the three next Sundays, for light infantry drill, and practice with ball cartridge, for all its



male population between the ages of fifteen and forty, and, as a necessary consequence, for a holiday for all its female population between those ages. After service at the English church—the Genevan were of course shut up—I strolled out into the next country. Geneva is not a very large State.

Half an hour brought me to the boundaries of Savoy, and to a pretty little town belonging to that kingdom. There were the churches, two or three of them, and all full. I must say that as evening closed in there was a good deal more fiddling and dancing than my English feelings exactly approved of; but still, every man of all those dancers, and every woman too, had been to church at least twice that day, which was more than could be said for the light infantry gentlemen and ladies on the other side.

Again my thoughts went back to England. I am happy to say that I could not find a parallel for the drilling and the State desecration of the LORD's day; but I had seen Gravesend steamers and Sunday excursion trains, and I am afraid that the worship of God had very little to do with either of them.

Here again was a subject for thought; it was a matter in which there could be no doubt; there could be no doubt that the LORD's day was a day of worship, or that the Protestant had been taught that it was, at least as much as the Roman Catholic. Why did the one regard it and the other disregard it?

There are many other points that I mean, as I go on, to illustrate in the same manner, showing you from facts which came under my own observation, where real undeniable Christian duties are taught and practised by other Churches, which either are not taught in our Church at all, or are taught so imperfectly as to fail in taking hold of the hearts of our people, and leading to any practical results. I show you the facts as they struck me, and give you the inferences I drew from them. But lest you should set me down in the

number of those factious and unfaithful men, whose sole pleasure seems to be to depreciate their own Church by magnifying that of Rome, I will tell you now a conclusion that I did arrive at at last, though as you will see from the nature of it, it was not till after a good deal of subsequent observation and experience.

You will observe that in speaking of the devoutness so remarkable in the Church of Rome, my instances have been drawn from the lower and uneducated classes. As we go on, you will observe that almost all my instances will be drawn from the same classes. In fact, with the sole exception of Belgium, in every Roman Catholic country with which I am acquainted the religious are the uneducated or the imperfectly educated. Of course you will understand that I am speaking of classes. It would be absurd to say that there is no such thing as a well educated and religious Roman Catholic layman. I have no doubt that there are many: but for all that what I say is true generally—devout as the lower classes are, among their intellectual superiors there are comparatively few who comply with the ordinances of their Church. There are many who do not go to Church at all; many who speak openly against it and ridicule it, while not a few are absolute Atheists and Infidels. It may be another reason why I am not particularly ambitious of the name of Protestant, that these last are in the habit of calling themselves Prodestanti. I must say I am a little suspicious of a Protestant Alliance which if I belonged to it would make it necessary for me to fraternize with such people as these.

Now let us, as before, compare this state of things with what we see in the Church of England. I will venture to say, as far as can be judged by outward actions, that this assertion will be found true; the most religious men among us are the best educated; and as generally speaking the best educated are the

upper classes, the upper classes of England are, at all events outwardly, (which is all we can judge from) more religious than the lower. How many of our poorer parishioners are non-communicants! While among the upper classes the non-communicant is the exception. The same holds good about going to Church; the same with regard to the outward respect shown to the Lord's day; the same in numerous other particulars. So that it would appear, as a general rule, that the strength of religion in the Church of England lies in the upper or educated classes; in that of Rome in the lower or uneducated.

Now, I would ask you, what inference would you yourselves draw from this difference between the two Churches. I would have you consider why, under the one, religion and education for the most part go together; why in the other, irreligion and education. And when you come to the poorer and uneducated classes, why is this exactly reversed? There is a reason for this. There is a reason for every thing, if we could only find it out.

I will tell you what conclusion I myself arrived at from these observations, and I will leave you to judge for yourselves how near it comes to the truth. I should say this;—the more the doctrines of the English Church are examined by the light of learning and reading, the more they are tested by history, and sifted by reasoning and comparison, the more strongly they are impressed on the heart—the doctrines are pure and true, therefore they stand the test, therefore those who are best able to subject them to the test (that is to say the most educated) are also the most religious.

Whereas on the other hand the more the distinctive doctrines of the Church of Rome, that is to say those doctrines in which she differs from the English Church, are proved by history and brought into light by learning, the more mixed and vitiated do they appear. So

that the educated, by whom alone they can be subjected to these tests, in despair of separating the false from the true, reject both, and thus become secret or open infidels.

I think this is clear enough ; but then, on the other hand, why are the poor and ignorant more religious and more devout in the Church of Rome, where the doctrines have been corrupted, than they are in the Church of England, where they have not been corrupted ? This seems a paradox.—Because the Romish Church, with all its corrupted and interpolated doctrines, has a far better system of teaching them. Because the Church of Rome speaks to the comprehension of the poor, and we speak above it. The poor are taught by what they see, rather than by what they hear ; for this very reason, that their senses are as keen as ours, but their understandings are not. This is where the Roman Catholics get the advantage over us. They act openly, as if they believed their religion, and were very proud of their religion ; we act as if we did not believe ours, or were ashamed of it ; they display theirs and put it before them ; we conceal ours and put it behind us. For years and years had we possessed an empire in India, before the inhabitants found out that we had any religion at all ; while the way in which the Spaniards colonised California, was by building churches, and drawing the Indians round them.

The real fact of the matter is, that we are *selfish* in our religion ; that is to say, we consider ourselves alone, and how such and such things strike us, and never reflect how they may appear to other people. We say that we are able to understand religion without its accessories. Therefore it shall have none ; we can abstract our thoughts and pray in a barn as well as in an ornamented Church ; therefore an ornamented Church is unnecessary ; we can pray without opening our lips in the public service ; therefore we will not



open our lips ; WE do not want sacred music to rivet our attention or warm our feelings, therefore there shall be no sacred music ; WE can understand all the doctrines of our religion without appointing stated times for teaching them ; therefore we will esteem one day as another. Lent and Easter, Advent and Christmas-tide, Holy Days, and Ferial Days, shall be all the same to us ; WE understand all about the Incarnation, and Atonement, and Penitence, and Judgment to come, without that nonsense ; and that which will do for us educated people, is quite enough for the poor. This is the way in which we act ; we forget that as the child is taught by the picture book, so the uneducated man is taught by the eye and the ear, rather than by the reasoning faculties ; we have fancied that we ourselves are able to do without these helps, and therefore we have insisted that he should do without them too, till we find that with the fast of Lent he has lost all idea of true repentance, with the season of Advent all just notion of a judgment to come ; that in forgetting CHRIST's holy days he has forgotten the doctrines of the Christian religion, and that, together with those of the Apostles, he has put aside the duties the Apostles taught. So proud are we of our reasoning faculties, that we despise that old wise punning maxim, that majesty when stripped of its externals is a jest ; we have stripped the majesty of religion of its externals, and call this protestant simplicity ; what wonder if the illiterate man is unable to appreciate it. The Bishop of London was once rash enough to call these things histrionic ; if histrionic means suiting the outward behaviour and act to the idea and inward feeling we wish to convey, decorating your churches to show your sense of veneration for Him Whose houses they are, and kneeling and bending before Him to Whom you would show your veneration, I say you must be histrionic, or you must be



content that all those who are taught through the eye and ear, that is to say, nine-tenths of all your people, should be unable to profit by your teaching. If you want to show an unlettered man, and still more a child, how to be devout, you must not be content with feeling devout yourself; you must *act* as if you were so, or he will not believe what you say. The parson who shuts up his morocco-bound quarto bible, gets up from his easy chair which has cost him fourteen or fifteen pounds, leaves his study, every corner of which is decorated with expensive pictures and ornaments, gets into his carriage furnished with every comfort, and goes into a church streaming with green damp, and officiates from a reading desk not quite so expensive as his own kitchen dresser, or from an altar, whose cloth he would be ashamed to see on his own hall table, really may, all this time, put God before all things; far be it from me to doubt him, but the poor man will; he is taught by the eye rather than the reasoning faculties; he goes by what he sees; and certainly what he does see, does not show him that the parson puts God before himself, or the blessings of the next world before the comforts of this. And what I say of the parson, I say of the squire also: the extreme luxuriousness of our houses, contrasted with the slovenly neglect of our churches, is not productive of religious feelings; nor is the cold, slovenly performance of our public worship productive of religious feelings; nor is the infrequency of our services productive of religious feelings; men learn to feel from what they see. That saying of the Bishop of London's, heedless as it was, and repented, as I have no doubt it has been, I feel convinced has been the loss of many a soul.

These are the sort of things that make the Roman Catholic poor Churchman more devout than the English poor Churchman. Our SAVIOUR says that the children of this world are, in their generation, wiser

than the children of light ; and so it is with the Church of Rome ; they who have chosen their distinctive doctrines, like fools, follow them up like wise men ; we who have chosen ours, like wise men, follow them up like fools.

Neither have we much to boast ourselves about our superior religion ; the doctrines of our Church are superior, but we are not superior ; at all events, we are deficient in this : we have been neglecting the spiritual wants of CHRIST'S poor ; as the Apostle would say, we have been attempting to feed them with strong meats, which they are unable to take in, and denying them the only nutriment which in their weak state they are capable of profiting by.

This is why I became a Tractarian. I felt convinced that the Church was losing her position and her hold upon the minds of her poor, by neglecting to teach within their comprehension. I resolved to do so myself, and I joined myself cordially to those persons who I saw were doing so. It is not that I attach an undue weight to form and ceremonial, but that I believe form and ceremonial the only method of conveying doctrine to the uneducated. As for this being the mode of teaching in use among the Roman Catholics, that is nothing to me, if such teaching will cause even their doctrine to be received, what will it not do to ours ? I am not above being taught by an adversary. I may reject Romish practices because they are wrong, and if I find them wrong, or if I find them contrary to those of my own Church, but I do not reject practices merely because they are Romish ; the man who will not fast on Friday for no better reason than because the Roman Catholics fast, must upon the same principle refuse to eat his dinner on Sunday when the Roman Catholics feast ; or like the Scotch, quarrel with his bread and butter, refuse to eat mince-pies at Christmas, because the Roman Catholics eat them then.

This is my position, and now I mean to illustrate it by examples which have come before my eyes. In these I mean to show you the poor Roman Catholics exercising what you must admit to be Christian graces, but to which, Christian graces as they are, you can produce no parallel in protestant England. And mind you, how many so ever examples I may show you, this by no means proves the superiority of the Romish doctrines; it only proves that those people have a better and more practical way of teaching those things which we hold as well as they.

We, for instance, as well as Rome, would teach our people the Christian privilege of making our wants known to God by prayer in His house, and the duty of expressing our gratitude to Him for temporal blessings. Show me, if you can, a Protestant parallel to this anecdote, to the truth of which I can vouch.

One day, as I was about leaving Heidelberg by the early train, I went to see a church that I had omitted to look over the day before; it was as early as six in the morning, yet, early as it was, the congregation was just dispersing, and I had no difficulty in finding the sacristan, who showed me over it. As we were passing and repassing, examining the windows and other peculiarities of the architecture, I was struck with the singular appearance of a woman, evidently of the lower orders, who was kneeling near one of the pillars with a number of children, also kneeling, behind her; much such a group as we sometimes see carved in stone on some of our ancient tombs.

"What was that woman doing there?" I asked him.

He answered, just as if it was a matter of ordinary occurrence, "Some woman, I suppose, who has something to ask of God."

I have seen many such things since, but they were strange to me then, and I could hardly take my eyes off

the motionless figures ; at last I sent the sexton to find out all about her. He came back shortly afterwards, and told me that it was the wife of a mason, who had been hurt by a fall two or three days before, that the family was quite destitute, and that they had come to ask help of God. Now observe, this was no mendicant trick, for it was six o'clock in the morning, and visitors could hardly be expected at that time. Without interrupting her devotions, I laid down some trifle by the base of the pillar ; upon which, without thanking me, except by a sort of inclination of the head, she went up to the high altar, followed by her children, to return thanks to God. Now all this might be very ignorant religion, but it was true religion as far as it went ; and, what is more, sincere faith. She trusted that God would supply what she wanted, she knew what He had said of His house being the place of prayer, and she came to that house in faith to ask Him ; and when she got what she wanted, she evidently believed that her prayer had been heard, and therefore did not thank me, whom she considered merely the instrument, but the God Who had sent me. Now a Protestant would say, could she not pray just as well at home ? Very true, so she could ; the question is, would she ? practically a Protestant under such circumstances, would have asked *me*, and thanked *me*, and very likely would have forgotten God altogether. That is the sort of thing I, as a parish priest, am more accustomed to.

Take another case. We all believe in the eighth commandment. My next shall be an instance of that.

I had come down on foot from the high Alps, and was passing through the little city of Aosta, the cathedral of which is well worth seeing, but I had my knapsack on my back and my Alpenstock in my hand, and was not altogether the figure for the inside of a church.

“What shall I do with these things ?” said I to my guide.

“Put them down here on the church-steps,” said he.

Now these church-steps projected into the market-place, which at that time was full of all sorts of rough looking people. I laughed and said, “I had much rather not put such a temptation in the way of Italian honesty.”

“Well,” said my guide, “there is no doubt but that the people of Aosta are the greatest rogues unhung” (he belonged himself to another valley, and, like all members of little communities, was narrow-minded enough to hate his neighbours cordially). “Your excellency is perfectly right; they are the greatest rogues unhung. But not so bad either as to *steal from God*.”

I put down my knapsack and Alpenstock on those steps, and on those steps after the lapse of two hours I found them, and along with them some eight or ten baskets of fruit and vegetables, which the market people had deposited there while they went to say their prayers, all of which, though looking very tempting, though perfectly unguarded, except by the unseen presence of God, were as safe as if they had been under lock and key. You will say, perhaps if these people had been thorough Christians they would not have broken the eighth commandment any where, they would not have confined their honesty to the church. Very true; they were not thorough Christians. They were very imperfectly taught Christians, but, as far as they were taught, they were taught practically, and they showed by their conduct that they believed what they had been taught, and, so far, were better than their Protestant fellow Christians of England, for though a basket of fruit would not be safer if left in the middle of any street in Brighton than it would in Aosta, yet I am afraid there is not a church in Brighton whose sanctity would afford it protection either.

Would you know how these things are taught, so as to have their influence on the rudest and most depraved



minds? The answer is easy—by teaching practically. You want to teach the reverence due to God's house and the abhorrence of God to a certain crime: act as you would act if God were present, treat as you would treat in that Presence the crime that He abhors. If you think God superior to yourself, don't make His house inferior to yours; if you think your Heavenly Sovereign superior to your earthly sovereign, don't pull off your hat to the latter, and forget to bow at the name of the former. These things, and a great many like them, are of little consequence in themselves, but they are of some consequence even to your own religious feelings, philosophical as you may think yourselves, and of immense consequence to those of the poor ignorant man, who, though he cannot reason, can see and can feel as well as you.

We spoke of the eighth commandment just now, let us take our instance next from the sixth. We all, I suppose, maintain equally that suicide is a crime.

Some few years ago a man, not more eccentric than wicked, got up into the gallery of St. Paul's, and committed suicide by throwing himself down. The blood was wiped up, the body was carried away, the story made a "curious fact" in the next day's newspapers, and there was an end of it.

The very same thing happened in the cathedral of Strasbourg. The cathedral was shut up, the bells were rung backwards, the place was pronounced desecrated, all service was stopped, till the Bishop and clergy of the diocese were collected for a solemn re-consecration, and then the first service performed was a deprecation of God's wrath for the crime committed in His house.

No doubt an educated Romanist and an educated Protestant alike know that suicide is forbidden by God. No doubt the Bishop of London and the Archbishop of Strasbourg were equally anxious that the people should be taught this Christian truth, but my question is,

which spoke the language most intelligible to the multitude? which of these two proceedings was most likely to have effect on the minds of the illiterate?

My next illustration has been already appropriated by my friend Mr. Gresley; it appears in one of his books called Colton Green, but, as I am myself the travelling Englishman he speaks of, I may as well reclaim my own story and tell it you in my own way, and draw my own moral from it. It will be a very appropriate story here in Brighton, for indirectly you have something to do with it.

I was travelling, as is my custom, on foot and with my knapsack on my back, and was entering one of the valleys of the Higher Alps of Savoy called the Valorsine. The little village, which takes its name from the valley, some six weeks before I passed that way had been overwhelmed by an avalanche, which had destroyed every house in it, and had seriously shaken the church itself, which, though protected by a strong ravelin of masonry from actual contact with the falling ice, had been exposed to the wind of it, which, strange as it may seem, is hardly less destructive. As for the houses, not one of them was standing.

When I came down the valley the whole people, men, women, and even children, were congregated like bees around their church, some chipping stones, some carrying lime, some mixing mortar, some pulling down the shaken walls, some splitting pine shingles for the roof, some strengthening the sprung beams. Every body was busy about their church, and not one was engaged about any of the houses.

A sudden shower drove me, as well as the labourers, into the church for shelter, and I got into conversation there with a man who turned out to be the priest, but not being quite so good a bricklayer as I doubt not he was a theologian, he was then serving as hodman to his own clerk, or sexton, the mason of the place. It had so

happened, when I was at Geneva a fortnight before, that I had been reading in the English papers one of those periodical squabbles about church-rates, in which you Brighton people stand up for the liberty of the subject to the great edification of all Europe, and as I wished to know how these benighted Papists managed such matters, I took the opportunity of asking the reverend hodman how all these people were paid.

"Paid?" said he; "why they all belong to this parish, except the architect the Bishop has sent us, he pays him."

"Yes," said I, "but how do you pay your own people?—I mean," continued I, hesitating and turning over in my mind what was French for church-rates, "how do you raise the money to pay these people their day's wages?"

His reverence laughed. "Why," said he, "you do not pay people for doing their own work. It is their own church that they are building, and they know well enough that they will get no prayers till they have finished it. I'll engage the rogues will not do a stroke of other work till they have done that."

Now, my dear friends, you must see that there is a good deal of difference between the sentiments of a Valorsine vestry and a Brighton one; yet, in good truth, there is not so very great a difference in the fact itself: if working on *their* own parish church was doing *their* own work, and I suppose it was; it is just as undeniably true that working on *your* parish church is doing *your* own work.

Is it not so? Is it not your parish church? Are you not the parishioners? And if it is not your church, just as much as the church of Valorsine was their church, whose church is it?

And yet in good truth I cannot blame you for what you do and say, and put in the papers about it, and for all your agitation about church-rates; it is not very

honest to be sure.\* However, leaving the honesty of the business out of the question, I do really think, both that what you do is quite natural, and also that there is a great deal of truth in what you say, and though I will not exactly take upon myself to affirm that you are honest, yet I do not know who has any business to blame you for not being so.

Beyond a doubt your parish church is yours in law, but what is it in fact? Those Valorsinois could make use of their church when they had built it, and did make use of it every day. Not a day did those people go to their work till they had said their prayers in that church, with their bricklayer parson to lead them. Not a time did they start on a dangerous expedition after the chamois, or any thing else, without first receiving the Holy Communion in that church of theirs. Yes, and many a time too, when the sky looked leaden and lowering, and the wind roared up the valley, and the white snow flakes flitted past the porch, or filled up the little narrow slits of windows, might you see an anxious wife, or a trembling mother, kneeling in some dark corner of that church, who had stolen away from the noise and bustle of her home, and had entered that ever open door to pray for the safe return of the travellers. Why their church was of as much use to them as their sleeping room or their kitchen, and was used as much. When it was thrown down they felt the want of it as much as they did that of their own houses. There was no need of a churchwarden or a vestry to levy a rate, the facts were before their own eyes, and their want was in their own hearts.

Now you go and try to do the same. Go to your

\* Baron Gurney, himself a dissenter, remarks: "I bought my house, or I rented my house, with a charge upon it called a church-rate. I paid less for my house, because there was that charge. I do not like to pay that particular charge, because I am a dissenter, but I do pay for it, and that willingly, because I do not want to put into my pocket that which does not honestly belong to me."



own church to say your prayers before you go to work in a morning, and you will find the door locked against you. Go to receive the strengthening grace of the Lord's Supper before you undertake a dangerous voyage, and you will be told that it is not Communion Sunday. Enter the church: it is Sunday, the doors are open now; enter your own church, and you will see your own property parcelled out into so many private holdings. If you have any doubt about the fact of ownership, take your seat in one of them and see the reception you will meet with. As for your wives and mothers praying for you when the winds rise, and the snow flakes fall, and the seas break upon this dangerous coast, they may pray in the street, but their house of prayer, theirs though it be, is shut against them. Blame you for forgetting that your parish church is your own church?—Not I. How should you remember it? Blame you for forgetting your morning service to Him who strengthens you for your daily work?—Not I. How can you pay it? Before I blame you for not paying your just dues, I should like to know whether you are to get your money's worth for the money that is asked of you?\*

This accounts for the difference between the Romanist and the Establishment man. This is the reason why the one is devout and the other is not devout. That of which a man has been long deprived he forgets the use of. Try it if you like with your body, tie up your right hand and you will lose the use of it. There is no such great difference between body and soul. You have been stinted in the legitimate use of your Church, till you forget, not only the use of your Church, but the use of those prayers which should have been said in it, and were not.

\* Since this lecture was delivered, I understand the people of Brighton have met and for the first time these eight years have voted a church-rate. This is very right and very honest, but it only makes their case the stronger; they have now done their parts, let them demand that their parsons do theirs.



Now let me tell you that these facts and these comparisons, (and I have plenty more of them for you) did make me think very seriously about the state of our own English Church. They made me a Tractarian. They did not shake my faith in its doctrines; no! not for one moment. I had been far too well grounded in them to have the smallest doubts, and if I had not been so grounded, that other set of facts, of which I told you before, about the condition of the rich and educated of the Romish Church, would have been quite sufficient corroborative evidence; the two set of facts lay side by side.

But if I did think that the *doctrines* of the English Church required no Reformation, I could not say so much of its practice. If I was in no way dissatisfied with the doctrines themselves, at any rate I *was* dissatisfied with the way in which those doctrines were laid before the people. So far as the illiterate were concerned, I could see no such great practical difference between withholding the Scriptures, and withholding the means by which those Scriptures were carried into practical effect in daily life. Nay, that the Romanist had the advantage, he was taught imperfect doctrines, he was taught corrupted doctrines, it might be, but he was taught. The Englishman had pure doctrines put before him, but he was not taught them in any way that he could understand, and so he put them aside altogether. There was the gold, I was satisfied of that, but to all practical purposes it was useless,—more useless than the tinsel by which it was counterfeited.

This is why I was dissatisfied with the English Church: most unjustly too, for I had hardly taken up my Prayer Book to examine into these supposed deficiencies, when I found that, in a great measure, the fault did not lie in the English Church but in me; that many of these things the Church had provided for, but that we her ministers had not acted up to her requirements.

She had told us all what to do, both clergy and laity, and we had not done it, we had substituted our private judgment for her commands, and, because we had done so, had shut our eyes to the fact that the Church had commanded it, and the question really was not how far the Prayer Book had departed from the law of CHRIST, but how far we had departed from the law of the Prayer Book.

This is how I came to be a Tractarian. I aimed at reforming the Church, and I began with that part of it which I could reform—myself. I wished to sweep the whole street and I began by sweeping before my own door. No one has a right to say that his Church is defective in any way, till he has himself fulfilled all that she requires him to do : no one can tell what the Church is capable of effecting, while he himself, her sworn servant, is neglecting the means by which she works.

The poor of the Church of Rome are more devout than the poor of the Church of England. Why? Obviously because the church doors are shut against them in England, and stand open night and day in Rome. Obviously because the daily sacrifice of prayer and praise has ceased in England and has not ceased in Rome. It is all very well for the rich, but who is to abstract himself either to pray or to meditate on the Scriptures in the crowded rooms in which our poorer brethren live? who is to collect his thoughts among the bustle of household work that is going on around him?

Well, but why blame the Church of England for this? it is not her fault, but the fault of her self-willed minister, who chooses to think for himself against her commands, and when she tells him to open his Church for daily prayer, and to pray in that church every day, presumes to mistake prayer for instruction, and to shut his church, because he is pleased to think that if he opens it there will be no congregation to pray in it.

What has he to do with a congregation? it is very well if a congregation comes, but in his Prayer Book there is not one word about a congregation at all; nay, in one case it is expressed in so many words that there may be no congregation, the word used is "privately." This is what the Church says. All Priests and Deacons,—all—whether they have a congregation or not, nay, whether they have a church or not, are to say daily, the morning prayer in the morning, and the evening prayer in the evening, either privately or openly, not being let by sickness or other urgent cause. Here is the command plain enough to understand, easy enough to perform, and requiring no one's consent but their own. But in case that Priest or Deacon has a church, then the Curate, that is to say, he who has the care of the church, *being at home, and not being otherwise reasonably hindered*, shall say the same in the parish church, or chapel, where he ministereth, and shall cause a bell to be tolled thereunto, a convenient time before he begin, that the people *may* come to hear God's Word and to pray with him. There is not a word here about the congregation as a necessary step to saying the prayers; they may come if they please when they hear the bell tolled. If they want to pray or have leisure from their necessary work to be able to pray, or if they want to hear God's Word read and have no means of reading it for themselves, they are at liberty to go to the church and to avail themselves of their parson's services, but he is to do it whether they come or not.

Now whose fault is it that the English poor are not devout, but the fault of the self-willed minister, who chooses to mistake prayer for instruction, and transgress the plain letter of his Church's directions? But if the people did not come they would not learn to be more devout; very possibly, people cannot be expected to become devout by word of command, but what has

that to do with it : he engages to do it, what business has he to say the people will not come? The Church of England, as well as the Church of Rome, says there shall be daily prayer; the Romish Clergy obey their Church, and their people are devout. The English Clergy disobey their Church and their people are not devout. Here is cause and effect plain enough. Let the Parsons at all events do their plain duty, and let them trust in God that the people will do theirs. How do they know that they will not? they cannot come if the church is shut; no parson on earth has a right to say, let my congregation do their duty first, and then I will see about my doing mine; he is put there to lead them.

But I say it is a libel on the English people to assert that they are naturally incapable of devoutness, and that it is impossible to teach them reverence for holy places. No doubt it is difficult to do it in the face of National Clubs and Protestant Defence Societies and godless newspapers, and "truly pious" busy bodies; but it is to be done. I appeal to my own churchwardens' accounts and ask whether Tractarianism has not been a considerable saving to the parish in the article of broken church-windows. Why, for the last seven years I have had two painted windows looking upon the road absolutely without protection, positively at the mercy of any boy who likes to throw a stone, and there they are to speak for themselves; for quite as long my church has not only been open night and day, but *has not had so much as a lock upon it*; and so it would be to this very time had not the Bishop found it out and ordered it to be locked. All the time that church was open I never missed so much as a hymn-book, and what was there to protect it except its own sanctity? People may be brought to a reverence for holy places, but not when they hear you preach it and see you neglect it. The Romanists cast in our teeth, that with all



our boasted purity of doctrine we dare not leave our churches open as they do. It is true,

“Pudet hæc opprobria nobis  
Et dici potuisse et non potuisse refelli :”

but whether the fault lies on the English Church or on the teaching of her ministers is a matter which might be questioned.

Now I will show you how we Tractarians manage such things. A well-known clergyman recently appointed to a living in a populous town, found that at six o'clock in the morning it was the custom of the parish to ring one of the church bells for five minutes. He asked what was the meaning of this ; no one could tell him, it was beyond the memory of that respectable personage the oldest inhabitant. “Well,” said he, “bells do not ring for nothing, and whether you can remember it or not there certainly must have been a service for the benefit of those poor fellows who have to begin their work early in the morning, and there shall be one as long as I am rector of the parish.” You have heard of that parish before and of that rector too, the names are very familiar to the public papers ; the parish is Frome, the rector is Mr. Bennett, late of S. Barnabas’.

This is Tractarian practice ; let us now see a Protestant Divine under similar circumstances. The Church of England has not a great many better or more faithful parish Priests than the late G. H. Langdon, Vicar of Oving ; it is unnecessary for me to add that the services appointed by the Church were duly performed in his parish, had they not been so I do not know how I could have called him faithful ; but perhaps it will not be superfluous to observe that in this particular case there was the more reason why they should be so performed, because there were a number of almshouses attached to the church, the inmates of which, old and infirm persons, were more likely to have leisure for the



week-day services. In the beginning of the present year Mr. Langdon died, but the regular services were very properly and conscientiously maintained by the curate appointed by the churchwardens, until the newly appointed Vicar came to reside, when the parishioners were perplexed by the following contradictory announcement made by the curate at the end of the Nicene Creed : " Saturday next, being the Festival of S. Philip and S. James, is appointed to be kept holy. But there will be no service, the Vicar having directed me to give notice that there will be no more service at this church on any day except Sunday."\*

It is hardly necessary to observe that the new Vicar was not a Tractarian. Perhaps he considered Daily Service the badge of a party ; that it is so considered the following anecdote may show.

A friend of mine having read my observation in page 25, that " without venturing any opinion about fasting and praying, *at all events* they are better things than drunkenness and debauchery," sent me the following story to show that this assertion, which I really had considered absolutely incontrovertible, was by no means taken as such by a living Bishop ; I may add that I have myself made inquiries respecting the facts and believe them to be substantially true.

The Bishop of . . . . had some time since a district incumbency to give away within the sphere of the South Church Union. He came to the conclusion that Mr. A., a hard-working, zealous clergyman, would make a very good incumbent. Mr. A. was summoned, came, heard of his lordship's intentions, and in the fulness of his heart began to talk about what he should do when put in charge of his cure. " In the Daily Service, my

\* This matter has been brought before the Bishop by one of the parishioners, and as one of these days was Ascension day, which he is very properly particular about, we shall possibly hear something more about it.

lord," he said, "I shall—" "The *what*, sir?" interrupted the Bishop. "I was merely observing," said Mr. A., "that when I have established the Daily Service——" "I am sorry to tell you," broke in the Bishop, "that in this case it will be my duty not to present you; Daily Service is a party badge, and as such I must discourage it."

So Mr. A. went home without the living, and Mr. B. was instituted instead. He did not trouble himself with Daily Service, but in place of it he set his parishioners an example of daily intemperance.

No doubt the Bishop considered this wrong, but probably he had not a great many to choose from; at any rate this man was not a Puseyite, only a drunkard; and he most likely thought that of two evils it was the part of a prudent Bishop to choose the least.

I once pointed out this matter of the Daily Service to an eminent Evangelical clergyman, and asked him how he read that part of his Prayer Book. What do you think his answer was? "Yes," said he, "that is very true, but you overlooked the clause about being reasonably let or hindered. Now I am let and hindered from daily service by going to visit my parishioners, which you must admit is a very proper thing to do; and therefore it may be called a reasonable hindrance. I cannot be in two places at once." What do you think of that for a Protestant Jesuit? these are the people who call *us* unfaithful. What I tell you is a plain fact. Certainly if that man was out visiting his parishioners at eight in the morning, at which time at the latest he ought to have had his morning service; why, all I will say of him is, that he was one of the Early Christians.

Now let us take another doctrine held by the Church of Rome, held also by the Church of England, and undeniably a Christian doctrine, I mean the absolute equality of all Christians in the sight of God, irrespective of their station in society. In the town of—never

mind where it was—where I lived when I was a boy, the parson's house was on the side of the street opposite to the west door of the church, and about that church there lingered still some reminiscences of its ancient daily piety, for though the daily sacrifice itself had ceased, there was a late morning service on Wednesdays and Fridays. This parson certainly was not one of the early Christians, for he seldom got out of his bed before nine or ten o'clock, and many a time has his half-shaven face appeared at his dressing-room window, as the bell rung out for morning service, with "Clerk, clerk, have you any congregation this morning?"

"No, sir, only two or three women in red cloaks."

"O, nonsense; I am not going to do the service for two or three women in red cloaks. Tell them to go away; say there is no congregation."

This is the way in which—not the English Church, but certainly one of her ministers, taught that there is no respect of persons before God. I do not say the English Church is guiltless in this, any more than I say that Eli was guiltless in the matter of Hophni and Phinehas, but I do say that she wants a different sort of Reformation from what is commonly supposed. She wants a proper authority over her Priests.

I do not mean to tell you that that is the way in which the English Clergy in general teach that doctrine, though I might possibly have given you another instance or two, if I pleased; but I do mean to say that that is the way in which almost all the laity teach it. Go into any one of your town churches, except where we Tractarians have been at work, and see where the rich pray, and see where the poor pray, and then write over the chancel-arch of that church, if you dare, this text: "The rich and the poor meet together, and God is the maker of them all." A friend of mine had finished just such a church as I am speaking of. There were the green-baized high-walled seats for those who

could pay for them, and there were behind them benches for the poor who could not. Proud was my friend of his handy work, and thoroughly disgusted was he when a wicked Tractarian asked him if he was not going to dedicate his church to S. Dives and S. Lazarus, who are the real patron saints of all proprietary chapels and of a good many parish churches into the bargain.

You have a few such in Brighton, the Bishop of London calls them five per cent. Speculations. I wish you would find out for me what their parsons do when in the usual course of evening lessons they come to the second chapter of S. James—do they read it, or are they in the habit of exchanging it, like Mr. Stowell, for “more edifying lessons”? These are S. James’s words, and very awkward words they are, in their natural sense at least. “If there come into your assembly a man with a gold ring and goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man in vile raiment, and ye have respect unto him that weareth the gay clothing, and say unto him, Sit thou here in a good place, and say to the poor, Stand thou there, or sit here under my footstool, are ye not then partial in yourselves, and become judges of evil thoughts? Hearken, my beloved brethren, hath not God chosen the poor of this world?—but ye have despised the poor. . . . If ye have respect to persons ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.”

We were talking some time ago about a bracketed Bible. Uncommonly convenient would the bracketed Bible be here. In fact I do not know what place these verses are fit for, except a Tractarian church with open seats.

This doctrine of the absolute equality of all baptized Christians, rich and poor, in the sight of God, is one of those true doctrines which the Church of England holds in common with the Church of Rome. I have shown you how the Church of England teaches it in



practice. Now I will show you how the Church of Rome teaches it.

Some years ago one of my parishioners was attending High Mass on some solemn occasion at Brussels. What business she had there is more than I can tell you: it was not with my consent or approbation. Much as I have travelled in Popish countries, I never went to High Mass or Mass of any sort in my life. However, business or no business, there she was, and, to her unbounded astonishment, the person who knelt alongside of her was the Queen of the Belgians. This is talking in language which poor people and ignorant people can understand. You may depend upon it that doctrine of the Christian religion, the equality of Christians before God, is better understood in Brussels than it is in Brighton. And in all countries there will always be a great many people who cannot make out the difference between "dulia" and "latria," but who for all that understand very well when a Church says one thing and does another.

Now do not let any one say that I am crying up the Church of Rome at the expense of the Church of England. I am not saying one word about the doctrines of Rome. I am speaking of her way of teaching all doctrines—the true doctrines of CHRIST'S Church, such as I have been speaking of, as well as those which she has corrupted. What I say is that she understands the art of teaching the poor better than we do. People may call this priestcraft—very likely it is, but priestcraft was a very good word once, like Knave, or Jesuit, or Protestant—but, like them, it lost its character by keeping bad company. What the word really means is, the science or knowledge requisite to fit a priest for the proper discharge of his office. Now if this science be applied to teaching corrupt doctrines (and I am sure I am not going to say that it has not been so applied in Rome,) then the end desecrates the means, and the



word becomes a term of reproach ; but if the Priest's science or knowledge of his business be applied exclusively to teaching the true doctrines of CHRIST's Church, and it must be so applied in the Church of England, because those are true doctrines which that Church teaches, then I say that it is the want of priest-craft that is the cause of all our troubles and all our shortcomings. The fact is that so many of our Church's ministers, deacons, and priests, and pre-eminently bishops, are appointed to their several offices without any sort of training ; that in nine cases out of ten they commence under a total ignorance of every duty belonging to them. An Irish curate that I had once, by an apt bull described the state of the English Church far better than I could do it. "The misfortune is," said he, "that in the Church itself, as well as in its ministers, *all our preparations are made afterwards.*" That is the point : when the Church of Rome has an office to fill she takes care to have a man to fill it.

If we imagine that our Church gains ground or even holds her own under such a system of discipline as this, we are grievously mistaken ; we cannot mark her advance or recession any more than we can mark the advancing or receding of the tide, but if we take any fixed object we shall soon see whether the tide *has* advanced or receded. On the evening before the battle of Blenheim every regiment was paraded for divine service, for every regiment had then its chaplain to perform it, and afterwards Marlborough assembled all the officers who could be spared from duty to receive the Holy Communion with their general, as men who were about to die. This took place about fifteen years before the suppression of Convocation.

Just one hundred and ten years after this, and about a hundred years after the suppression of convocation, one of Lord Hill's staff was regretting the prevalence of

Methodism in the division. "Poor fellows!" said the General. "Poor fellows! Well, I am very glad of it; it is the only chance of religion they have." And it was true; there was not a chaplain in the division: it is true still; half a dozen chaplains represent the whole of the English Church in our army now. If there is any religion in the 100,000 men who compose it, this may be owing to Methodism or to the voluntary principle, or to chance, or to Providence—not to the English Church. And this is but one example out of many. What is the use of the pure doctrines of the English Church if there are hundreds of thousands within her pale to whom they never come home? Rome does not act thus.

Now, mind you, do not say that I can find no good in the Church of England, and that all my comparisons are to her disadvantage. I say there is good in the Church of England, but the Church of England has no fair play. I am now comparing the Church of England with herself: the Church of England free, with the Church of England in captivity to the State. I am not going to pre-reformation times in speaking of Marlborough, or even to pre-revolution times. I am merely comparing the Church now with the Church before those days in which convocation was suppressed. What right has the Marquis of Blandford to speak of the inefficiency of the Church or any part of the Church? We are but what he, and such as he, our State legislators have made us. Why does he call our Cathedral establishments useless? they are—but is it our fault that a rich London rector is made more inefficient by having a rich Bristol canonry heaped upon him? Let him learn his lesson from the days of his great Ancestor.

Who ever thinks of a religious soldier? *Now* the epithet seems incongruous, inapplicable, and perhaps it is. How indeed could things be otherwise? What

provision do you suppose is made by this most Christian Government for the souls of all the hundred thousand men who fight its battles? A guinea a week is assigned to any poor curate picked up any where near their barracks, to preach one sermon a Sunday to men whom he has never seen before, and will never see again after their twelvemonth is out. If soldiers are without religion, whose fault is that when they have no one to teach them? If they have no one to teach them, whose fault is that when the regimental chaplains had become so dissolute, idle, and worthless, that their suppression was a positive gain to the army? If regimental chaplains had become dissolute, idle, and worthless, if they had no one to look after them, whose fault was that when Government had suppressed the Church's parliament and had undertaken to legislate for her themselves?

Now I do not mean to tell you that convocation did actually rule and govern the army chaplains, and that when convocation was suppressed they immediately went wrong. What I do mean to say is that at that time there still existed the remains of Church discipline, of which convocation, very much impaired no doubt, but not yet extinct, was the main spring: that fifteen years afterward that main spring was removed, and that from that time the bands of all discipline began to be relaxed: that the whole Church suffered by it, but that those portions of the Church which were less under the control of public opinion became so bad as to be worse than useless.

I have described the religious state of the army now, but let the Marquis of Blandford look to the state of things in the army before that suppression had taken place; let him look at the pages of Archdeacon Coxe. The Archdeacon knew very well what he wrote about, for he had himself served in those armies that he speaks of: his lordship will find there not only "that Marlborough dis-

couraged all intemperance and licentiousness in his soldiers, and constantly laboured to impress them with a sense of moral duty and Supreme superintendence," but he will find also how he did it; he will see that divine service was regularly performed in all his camps both morning and evening; (who can imagine soldiers at daily morning and evening service now?) that previous to a battle prayers were read at the head of every regiment, and that the first act after a victory was a solemn thanksgiving. "By these means," says the Archdeacon, "his camp resembled a quiet, well-governed city; cursing and swearing were seldom heard among the officers; a drunkard was an object of scorn, and even the soldiers, many of them the refuse and dregs of the nation, became, at the close of one or two campaigns, tractable, civil, sensible, and clean, and had an air and spirit above the vulgar."

I am very glad to have it in my power to make such a comparison as this when I have been drawing so many comparisons between the churches of Rome and England to the disadvantage of the latter; because it throws a very strong probability over my assertion, that *wherever* such disadvantage and inferiority exists, it is not that the Church of Rome is in any way superior to the Church of England: but that in all these matters the Church of Rome has had fair play, and the Church of England has not.

You talk about the frightful increase of Romanism all over the country, and turn up your Protestant eyes and hands at the Romish Bishops, and Romish cathedrals, and Romish doctrines, and Romish converts. Whenever the Record can detect a stray sheep slinking over to Rome, it catches him up, and parades him in its columns all over England, in a sort of triumph, just as the Chinamen do their prisoners in their wooden cages. It would seem as if these people imagined it a very creditable thing to the Church of England, that



all her children were leaving her and going to Rome,—a something to be made the most of—a something to be proud of.

Do you not see that all this cuts two ways? Do you not see that if it were true, which it is not, that such a great quantity of converts are flocking to Rome, it would be incumbent upon you to show *why* they went to Rome, because the *primâ facie* evidence would be against the Church of England? When the people of Ireland by shipfulls go to America, and nobody comes from America to Ireland, the *primâ facie* appearance is, that America is a better country to settle in than Ireland. And so any one would think, until you took the trouble of finding out and explaining some rational cause for this continual emigration, besides the comparative eligibility of the two countries.

And pray, why is not this just as true with respect to religion? If what the Record says were true; if hundreds of people of all classes were leaving you and going to Rome, what is the inference? If you cannot show some other cause, it must be that the Church of Rome is better than the Church of England.

You ought to be very much obliged to me; you ought to consider it a great confirmation of your faith, a great service that I am doing to the Church, when I point out to you, that there is a sufficient cause, when I show you that, be the secession much or little, the doctrines of the Church may have nothing whatever to do with it: that it may be traced, and fairly traced, to the teaching, the system, the discipline and the science of the two Churches, and to the skill and experience and faithfulness of their respective ministers, and to the domination of their respective governments. One of these two solutions you must take, if you acknowledge the fact at all. To what other cause can you trace it?

“To you Tractarians,” some bold Protestant will say.



Well, for argument's sake be it so. And what draws us Tractarians? If we lead our flocks to Rome, what leads us? You have still got the same difficulty; and you have another difficulty into the bargain, that it is not the fact: our flocks do not go to Rome. I will show you presently, and from facts which you will not deny, whose flocks do go to Rome, and what it is that leads them, or drives them: it is not our teaching.

I have been called the Pope of Westbourne for as long as I can remember. The Hampshire Telegraph every now and then is kind enough to turn its attention to me, and once made me a personage of such consequence, as to devote to my especial benefit two whole columns of abuse, for six or eight weeks on end, when they did not give the protectionists above half a one. Why! during the Popish Aggression riots, which those religious and Christian people the National Club got up in most of our parishes last year, one witty scoundrel numbered my house No. 666, which I dare say you will remember is the number of the Beast in the Revelation. And here have I been going on for these ten or twelve years, teaching those very same pestilent doctrines; preaching them, not on Sundays only, but on week days too, chanting psalms, intoning prayers every day of my life. And how many do you suppose these Romanizing practices have led to Rome? Not a man; not a boy; not a baby; and I am not such a very unpopular character either. Surely these doctrines and practices cannot be so very dangerous.

But you have only my word for it, and Westbourne is a long way off. Well, verify it for yourselves. If Westbourne is a long way off, Shoreham is within a walk. You all know the parson there: the Brighton papers have served him pretty much as the Portsmouth have served me; and, to the best of my belief, he deserves it quite as much. Now how many Papists have you got at Shoreham?

And here, in Brighton itself, where you have got a very large and very handsome church, after the most approved Tractarian pattern, well supplied too with Tractarian clergy, after the most approved pattern also, little collars, and long coat tails, "and eight or ten choristers, dear little souls," not exactly in "stoles," as Ingoldsby said, when he was in want of a rhyme and did not know precisely what stoles meant, but in garments which men call white round frocks, but the gods "white albs plain," and all the pomp and circumstance of glorious Tractarianism—where there is a great big town too, in which one might suppose there were people enough to afford converts to any thing whatever. Even here, you are so hard run for the article that the Brighton Herald is obliged to manufacture converts to order, and to make an April fool of the Record. We make converts to Rome! No, no, Rome knows better than that.

Yes, Rome knows much better than that; and if she knew it from no other grounds I will tell you what could not fail to show it her. You know that several of our clergy have left us, and have joined that Church. Rome no doubt rejoiced thereat, and made the most of it, and suffered the Protestant Defence and the National Club, that were blindly fighting their battles, to make the most of it too, but they had wisdom enough to conceal that, which to them was a matter of bitterest disappointment, though these zealous Protestants overlooked it. *How many of their flocks did these seceding clergy take with them?* Here and there one, and that was all, yet these were men who had laboured among their people without ceasing: these were men beloved by them to a degree you cannot conceive. The Romish Church is directed by many men who are in the habit of tracing effect up to its cause. They could not help seeing from this, if they found it out in no other way, that these converts had

not joined them because they preferred the doctrines of the Romish Church ; but because there was some one particular subject in the English Church which they could not reconcile to their consciences, and which forced them to leave it. Even when they left the English Church they preferred its doctrines : up to the very time of their quitting it, they taught those doctrines faithfully. Therefore it is, that when they do leave it, and this they do on some intellectual or historical point, which their flocks are not able to understand, they go alone ; for their flocks, well trained by their full and faithful exposition of the doctrines of their own Church, have become more attached to it than ever ; and, instead of following their teacher, stand aghast in wonderment, that any thing could have induced him to leave a Church, which he had taught them to love so well.

Do you suppose the Romish prelates are ignorant of this ? They know well enough that such a man as Archdeacon Manning, who could if he pleased have turned half the diocese round his finger, who had more personal friends, more attached dependants, more people who looked up to him for guidance and direction, more who would have followed him in implicit faith, than any man in England, would never have joined them alone, had it been the *doctrines* of the English Church that he was dissatisfied about. He went to Rome, and his curate went to Rome, and the parish in which they had been ministering faithfully and unweariedly for so many years, has not furnished Rome with a single convert. Why ? One little anecdote will explain it all. As soon as he declared that his conscience forced him to leave us, which he did upon the conviction that the supremacy claimed by the crown of England was incompatible with the law of CHRIST, one of his most attached parishioners asked his advice about leaving also. " No," he said, " you cannot

understand the point upon which I find it impossible to remain in the Church of England. *You* can remain in it with a safe conscience. Remain."

It is not among the parishes of such men as these that Rome finds, or expects to find, her converts; still less does she expect them from those who, though they fully coincide with them even in their protest against the usurpations of the State, the matter of episcopal appointments, and appeal on doctrinal points, do yet, to use Dr. Pusey's words, "conceive it their duty to abide in the ship, in the firm faith that Almighty God is conducting her, and that our LORD is in her."

I will show you where Rome seeks her converts, and I will show it you from a statement which was not drawn up by Tractarians.

No one, I suppose, will suspect the clergy of Hastings and S. Leonard's of Tractarianism. I think it must be well known to most of you, that there are few places in this diocese so blessed with a thoroughly Protestant clergy; few places where sound Protestant doctrine is more faithfully preached. One of these sent me a pamphlet some time ago, which, if it did not convert me, as no doubt it was intended to do, certainly did electrify me, to think that a man could write it, and then go to Church and read the services of his Prayer Book. At or about the same time was sent me a letter, part of which I am going to read you; and none of you will suspect it of being a Tractarian production.

"The parish of S. Mary Magdalen, near Hastings, was literally without any population, until the town of S. Leonard's-on-Sea (commenced in 1828) was built; which town now contains considerably over 3000 inhabitants, of whom upwards of 2000 depend for subsistence on the casual employment of residents and visitors. The only place of worship in connection with the Established Church of England for the whole population, is a Proprietary Chapel, called the Chapel of



S. Leonard's, built under the provisions of a private Act of Parliament ; this Chapel contains sittings for 800 persons, 200 of which are appropriated to the poor ; but these sittings being at the extreme end of the Church, under and at the back of, the west gallery, are almost useless, the invariable complaint of the poor is that they cannot hear the minister." In fact a regular S. Dives' and S. Lazarus' Church.

"The consequences of this spiritual destitution are, as might be expected, lamentable in the extreme ; large numbers of the poor attend no place of worship whatever, and (it is to be feared) are acquiring habits of utter disregard to all religion ; many, though not Dissenters from education or feeling, attend a chapel belonging to the Wesleyan Methodists, and are thus lost to the communion of the Church.

"But not only is the Church accommodation for the locality in question thus utterly inadequate to the wants of the existing population, but it is likely within a very short time to become much more so : new houses are in course of erection, the town is extending on all sides, but no extension of Church accommodation has yet taken place.

"Moreover, in the very centre of the district thus spiritually destitute, there has been erected within the last few years a Roman Catholic Establishment, in connection with the order of the Jesuits, whose avowed object is that of proselytism and aggression on the reformed Church of England. Its members are most active among the poor, inducing them to attend the services in their chapel, exhorting them to send their children to the schools which they have opened for gratuitous education, and in every way influencing them to join the Romish communion. They have lately commenced the erection of a magnificent church, have built large schoolrooms, and, in fine, the whole establishment is avowedly the centre of an extended



sphere of proselytizing operations, embracing not only this immediate neighbourhood, but a considerable part of the south coast of England."

In order adequately to estimate the effect of this centre of proselytising operations, let us put ourselves into the place of one of these neglected representatives of a neglected SAVIOUR, and look at the whole transaction from the point of view in which he would see it.

Within the short space of twenty years, a town has risen into life ; he sees streets, shops, hotels, libraries, markets ; all the signs of life and prosperity springing up around him ; three thousand people are congregated together, whose business is pleasure, and among these, he, with two thousand others, is called upon to minister to its votaries. There is no want of wealth ; its signs are everywhere evident ; well appointed equipages are seen on its parades ; its shops rival those of the metropolis ; its houses are palaces ; temples of Belial, the god of pleasure ; temples of Mammon, the god of gain ; but where is the house of God ? where is the provision for CHRIST's poor ? A Proprietary Chapel is built, which is said to contain sittings for 800 persons, and of these nominally 200 are appropriated to the 2000 poor ; but they are situated "under and at the back of the west gallery, in a place where they are almost useless," where these, the most ignorant members of the flock, those whose worship has most need of instruction, are altogether unable to hear the minister. "Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these My brethren, ye did it not unto Me."

In the midst of this spiritual destitution springs up a "magnificent church, which I will venture to say is not only magnificent, as God's palace ought to be, but has not a single private pew in it to shut out the poor man, and has daily prayers for his daily sanc-

tification ; "large schoolrooms" grow around it ; these are opened for "gratuitous education ;" while among those who, having hitherto "possessed no place of worship whatever, had been acquiring habits of utter disregard to all religion" active members are circulating, "inducing them to attend the services in their chapel," and "exhorting them to send their children to school."

And where do the funds come from, that provide this magnificent establishment, that spread this table in the wilderness of spiritual destitution ? Not from S. Leonard's, S. Leonard's is Protestant, and calls it "an aggression upon the reformed Church in England." To all outward appearance, as far as that poor man can see, this is a poor but devoted missionary college ; it asks of its Protestant neighbourhood none of its wealth ; it sends out no circulars through the diocese ; it spares not to take of its own flock and its own herd to dress for the wayfaring man ; whatever it appears to possess of this world's goods, are devoted to the service of CHRIST and of His poor.

I do not say that there may not be many ways of accounting for this, and explaining it and qualifying it ; I say that this is the aspect Romanism bears to any one of the neglected two thousand of S. Mary Magdalen's. A man such as we have been imagining is incapable of reasoning, he will have no very nice discrimination in Christian doctrine, but he is perfectly able to appreciate Christian practice, and to understand the meaning of brotherly kindness and charity.

Does not this, in some measure, account for the increase of Romanism in England ? The authors of the circular seem to think so, for they say, (though they protest they do it in no spirit of bitterness,) that their chance of success, (that of the Roman Catholics at S. Leonard's,) is greatly enhanced by the practical exclusion of the poor from the services of their own

Church, "owing to the total want of church accommodation before-mentioned; large numbers having on the Sabbath no place of worship of their own communion to which they can repair, are the more easily induced to attend the services of the Roman Catholic Church, to which they are so eagerly and perseveringly invited during the week."

Does not this give to the appeal of Cardinal Wiseman a sting and a truthfulness which in his own particular case it little deserved, but which comes in appositely enough here, especially when they are told that after appealing to the Bishop, the parson of the parish, the adjoining neighbourhood, and numbers of others, myself among others, to none of whom they had the smallest right to appeal, the liberality of those who have congregated these two thousand churchless and godless individuals is entirely exhausted? Might not these last with some show of truth borrow their Cardinal's words, and say, "If the wealth of the town be stagnant and not diffusive for spiritual purposes, if it in no way rescue the neighbouring population from the depths in which it is sunk, let there be no jealousy of any one, who, by whatever name, is ready to make the latter his care without interfering with the former?"

Now let me ask you, do you not think it possible that when these people were setting about building their "magnificent church," and their "large school-rooms," and their establishment of priests and subordinates, which was to be the centre of proselytising operations for the south coast, they looked out for some locality, where they had reason to believe that their seed would strike root? They did not choose Brighton or the neighbourhood of S. Paul's: I dare say if one could only find it out, they had some reason for this. And they did choose the ground which had been tilled by Mr. Vores and Mr. Jenkinson; perhaps they had some reason for that too. I cannot tell, of course, be-

cause I am not in their secret, but I should think it not altogether impossible that when they saw the Church's sacraments systematically put aside, the prayer of consecration in Baptism habitually omitted, when they heard that at least one family in that town had entered their communion upon those very grounds, namely, that under such circumstances they could not be sure that their children had rightly received Holy Baptism at all, they might possibly imagine, and the event proves that their ideas were not very incorrect, that a door was opened to them. I will not take it upon myself to say that these things did influence them, but I know this much, that that Church does not set up her establishments at random, and does reckon up the elements of success before she plants them, as the following anecdote will show.

Some eight or ten years ago I used to keep a little yacht, in which I visited a good deal of the southern and western coasts of England. I cannot tell you the precise year when I first landed at Penzance, but it was before the building of its second church. This town, which depends much for its prosperity on the success of its fisheries, was then apparently in a flourishing condition, and the villages of Newlyn and Mousehole, which line the western shores of its bay, had grown almost into towns, and bore at that time a clean and thriving appearance. The fruits of industry are not quite so rapid in their growth as those of fashion and caprice, and therefore the increase of Penzance had not quite kept pace with that of S. Leonard's. Still, however, at the time I speak of it numbered between eight and nine thousand inhabitants; and, as to meet the wants of these, a single church endowed with a stipend of £150 a year was considered sufficient, it is pretty evident that the religious condition of the place would have been very like that of S. Leonard's, had it not been for the dissenters. Thanks to their exertions,



Penzance was, when I knew it, a very religious place after its fashion,—certainly a very Protestant place,—but for the reason I mentioned, Church doctrines were comparatively unknown.

As the yacht stood across Mount's Bay our attention had been drawn to a group of buildings on a rising ground just outside the town, about which a number of workmen were employed. The buildings were still unfinished, but had been ably designed, and were at that time sufficiently advanced towards completion to produce a picturesque and churchlike effect. They proved to be the locality of a Roman Catholic colony, similar to that of S. Leonard's, and which, like that, consisted of a church, schools, and houses, for the accommodation of those employed about them. I soon found my way there, and entered into conversation with a man, who, dressed like a working man, seemed to be directing the labours of the rest, but who, as he afterwards informed me, was the priest in charge of the mission. This union of offices is by no means uncommon in the Romish Church. Most of their regular clergy are brought up to some trade, architecture as often as any. My Valorsinois priest, you remember, had taken the first step in the noble science—he carried a hod.

My first expression, after speaking of the architectural merits of the buildings, was an expression of surprise to find them at Penzance at all. Where did the funds come from? Who supplied the money?

"When God has work for us to do He always finds the means," was the somewhat evasive answer.

Who had sent him? His superior, the Bishop of some impossible place in *partibus infidelium*, for this was before the days of the Popish Aggression.

But was there a large Romanist population there? I had never heard of such a thing, but really the church did look as if it was the centre of a rich and

populous neighbourhood : it almost deserved the title of magnificent.

"No," he said, "there was no Roman Catholic population at all to speak of ; here and there a family it might be, but not what could be called a population."

Then what could have brought him there ?

His superiors had considered that the people were as sheep not having a shepherd (they did not seem to make much account of our dissenting brethren), and they imagined that the poverty-stricken condition of the Church of England in that place had opened them a door.

You will observe that the door was considered to be opened to them, because the discipline of the Church of England was not carried out ; not because there was no religious teaching in the place, for there was, but because that religious teaching was not Church teaching. Perhaps the converse of this proposition will suggest to you the reason why, when the discipline of the Church of England is carried out, the Roman Catholics do not consider the door opened. And then perhaps it may show you who it is that stands in the breach in Brighton, and why it is that you have no magnificent Roman Catholic church, no large Roman Catholic schools, and no numerous proselytizing Roman Catholic establishments here ? The growth of the fungus marks the previous rottenness of the *place*.

In the last two examples I have shown you a probable cause and a subsequent effect. I have not taken upon me to say *consequent*. I leave others to say that ; but I will proceed to show you how these things do act on the minds of religious but untaught people, In this instance I am happy to be able to take my example from a Church in communion with our own. It was a grand idea in a Church so poor, so desolate as that of Scotland, to attempt to build a Cathedral ; it was an offering to God, like that of the widow's mite ;

but, like the widow's mite, though precious as an offering of faith, it is poor in worldly wealth. You must not imagine the Dean and Canons of S. Ninian's at all like the richly endowed Dean and Canons of an English Cathedral; but if they are not like them in endowment, neither are they like them in their works. They are none of them rich rectors, with canonries super-added, visiting their Cathedral for three months in the year; they are Canons performing the duties of Canons; one presides over the Mission, one takes charge of the Choral arrangements, one superintends the Schools, and one manages the internal economy of the College. S. Ninian's is what our Cathedrals were once, before their revenues became an object of political or private patronage, and what they must be, and will be, again.

The story I am going to tell you happened since my visit there last summer, and therefore I will not vouch for the accuracy of all the details; the main facts are as I state them.

For several days the members of S. Ninian's College had observed three or four strange men, very regular at their morning and evening services; who they were nobody knew, but they were evidently countrymen, and not over well dressed; they appeared ignorant, or at least unaccustomed to what they saw, but were very attentive and respectful. One evening the Canons, on entering the choir, remarked that the whole nave was filled with strangers, not one of whom seemed ever to have been at church before; they did not know when to stand, or when to kneel, or when to sit, but they were trying their best, and watching what the regular congregation were doing; while among them, these three or four strangers, who had by this time learnt something of cathedral worship, were seen directing the movements of the rest.

In the evening a deputation waited upon the Dean :

“They were people living at a distance, employed, they said, upon some public works (to the best of my recollection they were quarriers;) there were as many as two thousand of them, and as they had no minister, or indeed any form of religion whatever, they had determined to send some of their number to Perth to see (as they expressed it) what sort of religion was best for them; they had visited, they said, the Presbyterian places of worship, both free and established, and did not much like them: they had visited an Episcopalian Church, of which I, having visited it also, can testify that the service was performed in a very high and dry way indeed, and they did not like that much better; and that now they had visited the Cathedral. They had not, they said, the smallest difficulty in making up their minds about which looked most like the worship of God, and now, having brought their friends to confirm their choice, they had on deliberation determined that a deputation should be sent to the Dean, begging him to send one of his Canons to organize them a Church.”

Now recollect, What was it that attracted these men in the first instance? Those very externals of divine worship which so many of our unthinking, selfish religioners call mummary, and which the Bishop of London, chiming in with the popular cry, denounces as histrionic. What was it that confirmed their choice? for these, you will not forget, were hard-headed Scotchmen, the very last men in the whole world to be hurried away by the impression of the moment, or any sudden outbreak of enthusiasm. It was the regular, constant, quiet work of the Canons, their scrupulous fulfilment of their engagements, the Spiritual authority which attached to them, and the weight which always accompanies a body of men acting together under discipline, the REALITY in short of the whole thing.

I do not know, I cannot say for certain, that the



reason why the Romish Establishment at S. Leonard's has succeeded, and why that at Penzance hopes to succeed, has anything to do with this ; but I think it has ; and I think also that unless there is some such corrective as the church of S. Paul's, to show people what the Church of England is capable of, the result will in all cases be the same ; whenever the disciplined Church of Rome is brought fairly into contact with the undisciplined Church of England, the latter will invariably lose her hold on the poor and ignorant, and perhaps on some who are neither the one nor the other.

It is evident therefore that the weakness of the English Church does not lie in her doctrines : these are as sound as ever they were in the purest days of Christianity ; nor even in her means of teaching them, when they are taught : clipped and curtailed and maimed as these means are, they are yet sufficient, if rightly carried out by faithful men. She has yet resources enough to withstand dissent on the one hand and Romanism on the other, but they are not so carried out every where, therefore she has no discipline. She has no means of restraining her own sons within the bounds of either her doctrine or her practice ; her laity may wander into every conceivable form of schism, without check or control, without forfeiting one of their privileges as Churchmen, and her priests may hold any sort of doctrine, under the protection of the Committee of Council.

We want no new powers, no new system, no fresh authority. We would introduce no doctrines that are not already in the Prayer Book, and no practices that are not already in the Church. All we stand up for are the rights of the Church as secured to us by the 14th of Charles II. For these we are Tractarians, or Unionists, or whatever you may please to call us. If we had not first reformed ourselves, if we had not, so far as lay in our power, ruled our own lives and con-

duct and church practices by those laws which we desire to restore, we might very fairly be twitted with the accusation of binding burthens grievous to be borne and laying them upon others without ourselves touching them with our fingers. But we first show the deficiencies under which the Church is labouring, we prove our sincerity by labouring, singly and unsupported, to make them good, and, having done so, we call upon the Church to vindicate her own laws, upon the State to give us the same liberty which the dissenter claims as matter of right.

Until we have effected this we do not stand on an equality with Rome. We see that our doctrines do not take the same hold of our people that the doctrines of that Church do upon theirs. We see the reason of it and we endeavour to remedy it. How have we succeeded? In single instances admirably. Many a wanderer have we replaced in the old paths, where is the good way, where they have found rest for their souls. But as a National Church, no! our efforts hitherto have been single and unsupported, our successes are single and individual also. Quite enough has been done to show the truth of the system, but not enough to give it a general hold on the minds of the people.

And what is necessary to give it this hold? The restoration of the Church's deliberative and legislative functions. How can the Church be fairly twitted with the sin of Eli, when she has no power to restrain her children? Our doctrines take no hold on the affections of our people, because we have no common system of teaching, no common principle of action. Why have we not? because we have no Church authority; because we have nothing to which we can appeal for enforcing that authority, or even for asserting it.

Since the suppression of our Synodical action, the Church has been gradually sinking deeper and deeper into lethargy, and wandering wider and wider into irre-

gularity ; every one of her parish Priests stands singly, each does that which is right in his own eyes, and therefore each rests on his own unsupported authority.

Not so the Church of Rome. The Romanist may stand alone in the place where he finds himself, but he is still one of a great company, he may be opposed by his whole neighbourhood, but he is sustained by his brethren. He speaks with authority, because the doctrine which he teaches is not his own, but the doctrine of his Church. On her part that Church supports him in his authority, by casting out all who refuse to listen, while at the very same time she maintains her own authority, by casting him out, if he departs from the teaching which she commands. He has no difficulty in enforcing salutary discipline, because the discipline which he enforces is that of his Church, and she confirms it with her sentence ; but at the very same time she effectually prevents him from giving grounds for scandal, in deviating from her recorded ritual, by rejecting him, and withdrawing her protection from him, as soon as he attempts himself to go beyond her rules.

And what do we ? connected with each other by name, and by position, and by neighbourhood, we are, indeed and in truth, disconnected for want of a central authority ; we may see our needs, we may attempt a reformation, but our reformation is a thing of shreds and patches, here and there we may urge a point of stricter discipline ; but it is no part of a regular system, its pressure is unequal, it chafes and irritates, but it cannot amend. Here and there a solitary individual will raise his voice against the universal laxity, and labour hopelessly and thanklessly, to overcome the effects of his predecessor's sloth or self-will ; strive for a time, remain on earth just long enough to prove that CHRIST has not yet cast off His Church, then die and be forgotten ; while his spirit, if still sentient of things upon the

earth, sees his plans reversed, his systems set at nought, his people sinking again into their former spiritual sloth, and irreverence and irreligion again closing round them.

To fix and consolidate our work we must have united action, our convocation and our synods. We admit that during the dark times of sloth and ignorance through which we have been passing, God has dealt mercifully with us in depriving us of what we might easily have misused, and should have misused, but we conceive that we shall best show our fitness for freedom, and obtain the restoration of it from God, by carrying out in our own persons, so far as in our power lies, the existing privileges, customs, and practices, of the Church, and by maintaining her rights against all opposition and all unpopularity.

And now let me sum up :—

By showing you how it was that I myself became a Tractarian, that is to say, by showing you how and by what means my attention was directed to the deficiencies of the English Church, I have shown you that Tractarianism or, to speak more intelligibly, Reform, is absolutely necessary.

And in working out my experiences I think that I have shown you also, that this reform, which we so much need, is not one of doctrine but of discipline ; and beyond this that it is not a legislative reform, but a practical reform that we want, not new laws, but the power of using those we have ; that the Church has already all the laws and all the customs necessary for putting her at least on a par with Rome ; that if her doctrines are not conveyed to her poorer classes it is not the fault of her laws but of her supineness. In short, that as far as a captive can be said to have any responsibility, her sin is the sin of Eli, her sons make themselves vile, and she restraineth them not.

But this would seem to cast blame upon our Bishops



who are appointed to govern the Church. Let me not be supposed to allude to our own Bishop, who is rather the exception to my rule than the exemplification of it, or to any particular Bishop, but to the Bishops as a class, when I say that no one can see the irregularities committed in the English Church and persisted in without reproof or correction, and can pronounce her governors blameless.

They plead that they have no power to put the Church's laws into execution. Of course they have no power without their Synod; how should they have power? who ever out of Rome heard of an autocratic Bishop? In the old days when the maxims "no Bishop, no Church," "without the Bishop do nothing," were in all men's mouths as undeniable axioms, no Bishop thought of governing his diocese by the law that came out of his own mouth. Still less did he rely on acts of parliament to support his authority, still less did he "who had judgment of things pertaining to eternal life, set them to judge who are least esteemed in the Church," or if he did, there was not wanting an Apostle to reprove him. Men now, some openly, but all more or less practically, repudiate the idea of doing all things with the Bishop, for the very evident reason that the Bishop has ceased to do all things with them.

This subject, however, I mean to treat more at large in a subsequent lecture. In the meantime I would merely observe, that Bishops cannot be greatly surprised that we pay but little attention to opinions, which at the very best are their own private opinions, and not those of the Church, but which generally are not even their own opinions at all, but faint and uncertain echoes of a popular clamour which is itself both idle and irreligious.

They sit in Moses' seat; all therefore of the laws of the Church that they tell us to observe, that we shall

observe and do, but we will neither do after their acts nor will we profess much respect for the private judgments of men whom we see straining at such gnats as a chanted psalm, a surplice, or a pair of candlesticks, and swallowing such enormous camels as the wilful alteration of the Prayer Book, the deprivation to their Church of six-sevenths of its allotted services, and the exclusion of the poor from the house of their own God.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY  
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

06/2009